

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary		Application No. 10/092,072	Applicant(s) ROTHSCHILD, WAYNE H.
Examiner Matthew D. Hoel		Art Unit 3714	

All Participants:

(1) Matthew D. Hoel, examiner.

(2) Justin Swindells, attorney.

Date of Interview: 11 January 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: P.M.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
FR (04-21-2009).

Claims discussed:
1-3,6-15,19,21-35,39-46,48-51,62-64,66-86.

Prior art documents discussed:
Harkham (WO 01/91866 A1, PCT/US01/17285); Karmarkar (6,508,709 B1); Larose (2002/0087876 A1).

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/M. D. H./

Examiner, Art Unit 3714

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The applicant submitted an appeal brief 11-12-2009. The examiner discussed with SPEs Vo and Suhol that he believed the most relevant part of the specification (2003/0171149 A1) was Paras. 30 & 31 discussing enhanced and basic audiovisual features, depending on whether the wageror is located at or remotely from the casino. Atty. Justin Swindells discussed the possibility of putting dep. clm. 79 and corresponding limitations into the independent claims, and later e-mailed proposed amendments to this effect with authorization to enter them by examiner's amendment. The examiner subsequently called Mr. Swindells on 01-21-2010 to change the dependencies of claims 25, 26, 28 and 29 to depend from claim 10, as claims 24 and 27 had been cancelled by the proposed amendment. The claims are entered as submitted by the applicant except for the corrections to the dependencies of 25, 26, 28, and 29..